UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,365	07/07/2003	Christopher J. M. Meade	01-1364	7867

28519 7590 05/10/2010

MICHAEL P. MORRIS
BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM USA CORPORATION
900 RIDGEBURY RD
P O BOX 368
RIDGEFIELD, CT 06877-0368

EXAMINER	
OLSON, ERIC	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1623	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/10/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO.e-Office.rdg@boehringer-ingelheim.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,365	MEADE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ERIC S. OLSON	1623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 March 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,5,7-11,27-38,43 and 44* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,5,7-11,27-38,43 and 44* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

This office action is a response to applicant's communication submitted March 9, 2010 wherein the rejections of record in the previous office action are traversed. This application claims benefit of provisional application 60/407895, filed September 3, 2002, and claims priority to foreign application DE10230769.5, filed July 9, 2002.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 27-38, 43, and 44 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 27-38, 43, and 44 as amended are examined on the merits herein.

The following rejections of record in the previous office action are maintained:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 27-38, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeadon et al. (US pre-grant publication 2004/0147544, of record in previous action) in view of Meissner et al., (US patent 6706726, of record in previous action, previously published in German as PCT international publication WO02/32899 (Included with PTO-1449 12/22/2003, and German patent publication DE10050994A1, of record in previous action) in view of Hoffman et al. (US patent 6417190, of record in previous action, first published as WO00/35428, also of record in previous action) in view of Freund et al. (US pre-grant publication 2001/0008632, of record in previous action, previously published in German as PCT international publication WO98/27959, reference of record in previous action)

Yeadon et al. discloses an inhaled combination of a selective PDE4 inhibitor and an anticholinergic agent. (p. 1 paragraph 0011) The PDE4 inhibitors include tricyclic nitrogen heterocycles that are similar in structure to the claimed PDE4 inhibitors, (p. 2 paragraph 0020) and the anticholinergics include compounds having a similar structure to those recited in instant claim 1. (p. 3 paragraphs 0049-0052) The compositions can include a pharmaceutically acceptable anion such as bromide. (p. 3 paragraph 0053) This pharmaceutical composition can be used to treat respiratory diseases including asthma, chronic or acute bronchoconstriction, chronic bronchitis, small airway obstruction, emphysema, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. (p. 4 paragraph

0068) The composition can be administered by inhalation as an aerosol spray either with or without a propellant. (p. 8 paragraph 0112) For use in an atomizer, the composition can be prepared as a solution containing the active compounds, propylene glycol, (a co-solvent according to instant claims 30-31) sterile water, ethanol, and sodium chloride. (p. 8 paragraph 0114) The overall dose of the active substances is preferably between 1 µg and 20 mg. (p. 9 paragraph 0115) The ratio of the two agents to one another will be determined by the potency of the individual compounds being used. (p. 9 paragraph 0116)

Yeadon et al. does not disclose a pharmaceutical combination comprising the specific anticholinergics and PDE-4 inhibitors recited in instant claim 1. Yeadon et al. also does not disclose compositions having the exact doses and ratios of active substances recited in instant claims 8-11 or a propellant-free inhalable solution having a pH of between 2 and 7 or 2 and 5. Yeadon et al. does not disclose a composition comprising an antioxidant such as ascorbic acid, vitamin A, vitamin E, or tocopherol.

Meissner et al. discloses anticholinergic compounds of a general formula which includes **1** as an embodiment. (Example 1, column 10, lines 10-29) These agents are expected to be useful in the treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and asthma. (column 19, lines 63-65) Meissner et al. specifically discloses that these compounds may be administered by inhalation. (column 22, lines 26-29) Specific formulations described by Meissner et al. include an aerosol spray for use in an inhaler, (column 24, lines 40-55) an inhalable solution according to instant claims 25-29, 32, 33, 36, and 39 for use in an inhaler according to instant claim 42, (column 24, lines 58-67)

and a powder comprising the active substance and lactose monohydrate. (column 25, lines 15-20)

Hoffmann et al. discloses tricyclic heterocycles that are selective PDE-4 inhibitors. (column 2 lines 8-12) These compounds have the same structure **2a** recited in the instant claims. (column 2 lines 2-46) These compounds can be used as their physiologically acceptable salts by the addition of inorganic or organic acids, including acids such as succinic, hydrobromic, acetic, fumaric, maleic, methanesulfonic, hydrochloric, and other acids recited in instant claim 28. (column 3 lines 22-30) Solutions of these compounds can contain preservatives such as p-hydroxybenzoates, and stabilizers such as alkali metal salts of EDTA. (column 5 lines 58-62) A therapeutically effective dose is between 10-300 mg. (column 6 lines 4-6)

Freund et al. discloses aqueous solutions for the production of propellant-free aerosols for inhalation. (p. 1 paragraph 0001) The compositions are dissolved in aqueous or ethanolic solution. (p. 1 paragraph 0004) Active agents that can be included in these solutions include anticholinergics of similar structure to the claimed compounds, for example tiotropium bromide, ipratropium bromide, oxitropium bromide, and trospium chloride. (p. 1 paragraph 0014 - p. 2 paragraph 0023) In one embodiment a solution of ipratropium bromide is used having a pH of 3.4, with benzalkonium chloride as a preservative. (p. 2 paragraph 0048) In this example the solution can contain no further or ingredients in one embodiment, or optionally can contain sodium EDTA. In another embodiment the solution contains HCl to adjust the pH. (p. 3 paragraph 0050) Also note that a solution of benzalkonium chloride at pH 3.4 contains both H^+ ions and

Cl^- ions, and therefore is reasonably considered to contain small amounts of hydrochloric acid even without the addition of exogenous HCl. Freund et al. also discloses solutions containing ascorbic acid as a complexing agent. (p. 1 paragraph 0011)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to produce a composition similar to those disclosed by Yeadon et al. comprising the anticholinergic drug of Meissner et al. in place of the anticholinergics disclosed by Yeadon et al. and the PDE-IV inhibitor disclosed by Hoffman et al. in place of the PDE-IV inhibitors disclosed by Yeadon et al. and to use this combination in the therapeutic method of claim 43. It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare this composition as a propellant-free inhalable aerosol as described in claims 25-39.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the composition using the anticholinergic compound **1** of Meissner et al. in place of the anticholinergics of Yeadon et al. because this compound is also an anticholinergic, is structurally similar to the compounds of Yeadon et al., and is useful for treating the same condition. (i.e. obstructive pulmonary disease) Similarly one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the PDE-IV inhibitors of Hoffman et al. because they have the same function and closely similar structure to those used by Yeadon et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare an aerosol containing additional ingredients as described by claim 23 because adding standard ingredients such as preservatives, stabilizers, and surfactants is standard practice in the

art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the composition as a propellant-free aerosol because Meissner et al. discloses such a solution as a means for pulmonary delivery of the anticholinergic, and because Yeadon et al. also discloses such a solution for use in an atomizer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use sodium EDTA in this solution because Meissner et al. discloses a solution comprising EDTA and sodium EDTA is a common form of EDTA. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the solution with only benzalkonium chloride or benzalkonium chloride and sodium EDTA because these solutions consist essentially of the same ingredients as the propellant-free solution disclosed by Meissner et al. and differ only in the absence of HCl, which is not essential to the biological function of the active ingredient.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably expected success in preparing the pharmaceutical composition with the compounds of Meissner et al. and Hoffman et al. because of the similarities between these compounds and those already known to be useful in this invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make various minor modifications such as adding ingredients as described by claims 30, 31, and 34 or subtracting them as described in instant claims 18, 36, and 37 because these modifications are minor modifications which are well within the routine skill of one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore choosing specific amounts and ratios of the disclosed compounds, as described by Yeadon et al. above, is similarly within the ordinary level of skill in the art.

It would also have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prepare the compositions of Yeadon et al. in view of Meissner et al. in view of Hoffman et al. as propellant-free solutions according to Freund et al. having a pH of 3.4, and containing ascorbic acid. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use this pH and complexing agent because Yeadon et al. in view of Meissner et al. in view of Hoffman et al. already discloses inhalable formulations including propellant-free solutions, which are similar to those described by Freund et al. to also be used for inhalation of therapeutic agents. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably have expected success because the formulation of Freund et al. is already disclosed to be useful for delivery of pharmaceutical ingredients by inhalation, particularly anticholinergics.

Therefore the invention taken as a whole is *prima facie* obvious.

Response to Argument: Applicant's arguments, submitted March 9, 2010, with respect to the above ground of rejection, have been fully considered and not found to be persuasive to remove the rejection. Applicant argues that Yeadon specifically points out certain anticholinergics and PDE-IV inhibitors for use in the disclosed invention and does not direct one of ordinary skill in the art towards Applicant's invention, which is a combination of a different anticholinergic and a different PDE-IV inhibitor. However, The reference, while it recites certain specific embodiments of anticholinergics and PDE-IV inhibitors as examples, allows in its broadest embodiment for a combination of any anticholinergic with any PDE-IV inhibitor, for example on p. 1 paragraphs 0010-0012 of Yeadon et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have ascertained by this

generic disclosure that a combination of any anticholinergic and any PDE-IV inhibitor is suitable for providing the therapeutic benefit described by the reference. While certain PDE-4 inhibitors and anticholinergic drugs are exemplified by the reference, they are provided solely as examples and are not presented as limiting or exhausting the class of compounds that can be used in combination. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood Yeadon as teaching that any prior art anticholinergic can be combined with any prior art PDE-IV inhibitor to practice the invention. Thus there would be a clear motivation and expectation of success in using any of these prior art compounds, for example the prior art compounds of Meissner and Hoffman, in a composition according to Yeadon.

Note that this reasoning regarding the substitution of one anticholinergic or PDE-IV inhibitor for another is very similar to rationale affirmed by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in the decision submitted September 29, 2008 in this application.

For these reasons the rejection is deemed proper and made **FINAL**.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 27-38, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeadon et al. (US pre-grant publication 2004/1047544, of record in previous action) in view of Meissner et al., (US patent 6706726, of record in previous action, previously published in German as PCT international publication WO02/32899, included with PTO-1449 December 22, 2003, and German patent publication DE10050994A1, of record in previous action) in view of Hoffman et al. (US

patent 6417190, of record in previous action, first published as WO00/35428, of record in previous action) in view of Hochrainer et al. (Foreign patent publication CA2345675, of record in previous action, also published as US pre-grant publication 2001/0032643, of record in previous action)

Yeadon et al. discloses an inhaled combination of a selective PDE4 inhibitor and an anticholinergic agent. (p. 1 paragraph 0011) The PDE4 inhibitors include tricyclic nitrogen heterocycles that are similar in structure to the claimed PDE4 inhibitors, (p. 2 paragraph 0020) and the anticholinergics include compounds having a similar structure to those recited in instant claim 1. (p. 3 paragraphs0049-0052) The compositions can include a pharmaceutically acceptable anion such as bromide. (p. 3 paragraph 0053) This pharmaceutical composition can be used to treat respiratory diseases including asthma, chronic or acute bronchoconstriction, chronic bronchitis, small airway obstruction, emphysema, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. (p. 4 paragraph 0068) The composition can be administered by inhalation as an aerosol spray either with or without a propellant. (p. 8 paragraph 0112) For use in an atomizer, the composition can be prepared as a solution containing the active compounds, propylene glycol, (a co-solvent according to instant claims 30-31) sterile water, ethanol, and sodium chloride. (p. 8 paragraph 0114) The overall dose of the active substances is preferably between 1 µg and 20 mg. (p. 9 paragraph 0115) The ratio of the two agents to one another will be determined by the potency of the individual compounds being used. (p. 9 paragraph 0116)

Yeadon et al. does not disclose a pharmaceutical combination comprising the specific anticholinergics and PDE-4 inhibitors recited in instant claim 1. Yeadon et al. also does not disclose compositions having the exact doses and ratios of active substances recited in instant claims 8-11 or a propellant-free inhalable solution having a pH of between 2 and 7 or 2 and 5 according to instant claims 26 and 27. Yeadon et al. does not disclose a composition having a pH range of between 2-5 or a composition comprising an antioxidant such as ascorbic acid, vitamin A, vitamin E, or tocopherol.

Meissner et al. discloses anticholinergic compounds of a general formula which includes **1** as an embodiment. (Example 1, column 10, lines 10-29) These agents are expected to be useful in the treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and asthma. (column 19, lines 63-65) Meissner et al. specifically discloses that these compounds may be administered by inhalation. (column 22, lines 26-29) Specific formulations described by Meissner et al. include an aerosol spray for use in an inhaler, (column 24, lines 40-55) an inhalable solution according to instant claims 25-29, 32, 33, 36, and 39 for use in an inhaler according to instant claim 42, (column 24, lines 58-67) and a powder comprising the active substance and lactose monohydrate. (column 25, lines 15-20)

Hoffmann et al. discloses tricyclic heterocycles that are selective PDE-4 inhibitors. (column 2 lines 8-12) These compounds have the same structure **2a** recited in the instant claims. (column 2 lines 2-46) These compounds can be used as their physiologically acceptable salts by the addition of inorganic or organic acids, including acids such as succinic, hydrobromic, acetic, fumaric, maleic, methanesulfonic,

hydrochloric, and other acids recited in instant claim 28. (column 3 lines 22-30) Solutions of these compounds can contain preservatives such as p-hydroxybenzoates, and stabilizers such as alkali metal salts of EDTA. (column 5 lines 58-62) A therapeutically effective dose is between 10-300 mg. (column 6 lines 4-6)

Hochrainer et al. discloses a two-chamber inhaler device containing a powdered active agent and a liquid solvent, wherein the active agent is dissolved in the solvent before use. (p. 3 paragraphs 3-4) Preferred solvents are propellant-free liquids including water, ethanol, and mixtures thereof. (p. 16 lines 2-14) In one embodiment EDTA or sodium EDTA is added. (p. 16 last paragraph) In another preferred embodiment the pH is between 3.0 and 4.0, adjusted by the addition of hydrochloric acid. (p. 17 second paragraph) Vitamins including ascorbic acid and vitamin E can be included as antioxidants. (p. 13 fifth paragraph) Specific examples of active agents that can be administered in this manner include tiotropium bromide, ipratropium bromide, oxitropium bromide, and tropium chloride. (p. 8)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to produce a composition similar to those disclosed by Yeadon et al. comprising the anticholinergic drug of Meissner et al. in place of the anticholinergics disclosed by Yeadon et al and to use this combination in the therapeutic method of claim 43. It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare this composition as a solvent-free inhalable aerosol as described in claims 25-39.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the composition using the anticholinergic compound **1** of Meissner et al. in place of the

anticholinergics of Yeadon et al. because this compound is also an anticholinergic, is structurally similar to the compounds of Yeadon et al., and is useful for treating the same condition. (i.e. obstructive pulmonary disease) Similarly one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the PDE-IV inhibitors of Hoffman et al. because they have the same function and closely similar structure to those used by Yeadon et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare an aerosol containing additional ingredients as described by claim 23 because adding standard ingredients such as preservatives, stabilizers, and surfactants is standard practice in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the composition as a propellant-free aerosol because Meissner et al. discloses such a solution as a means for pulmonary delivery of the anticholinergic, and because Yeadon et al. also discloses such a solution for use in an atomizer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use sodium EDTA in this solution because Meissner et al. discloses a solution comprising EDTA and sodium EDTA is a common form of EDTA. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the solution with only benzalkonium chloride or benzalkonium chloride and sodium EDTA because these solutions consist essentially of the same ingredients as the propellant-free solution disclosed by Meissner et al. and differ only in the absence of HCl, which is not essential to the biological function of the active ingredient.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably expected success in preparing the pharmaceutical composition with the compounds of Meissner et al. and Hoffman et al. because of the similarities between these compounds and those already

known to be useful in this invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make various minor modifications such as adding ingredients as described by claims 23, 30, 31, and 34 or subtracting them as described in instant claims 18, 36, and 37 because these modifications are minor modifications which are well within the routine skill of one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore choosing specific amounts and ratios of the disclosed compounds, as described by Yeadon et al. above, is similarly within the ordinary level of skill in the art.

It would also have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prepare the compositions of Yeadon et al. in view of Meissner et al. in view of Hoffman et al. as propellant-free solutions according to Hochrainer et al. having a pH of 3.0-4.0. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because Yeadon et al. in view of Meissner et al. in view of Hoffman et al. already discloses inhalable formulations including propellant-free solutions, which are similar to those described by Hochrainer et al. to also be used for inhalation of therapeutic agents. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably have expected success because the formulation of Hochrainer et al. is already disclosed to be useful for delivery of pharmaceutical ingredients by inhalation, particularly anticholinergics.

Therefore the invention taken as a whole is *prima facie* obvious.

Response to Argument: Applicant's arguments, submitted March 9, 2010, with respect to the above ground of rejection, have been fully considered and not found to be persuasive to remove the rejection. Applicant's arguments are the same as those made with respect to Yeadon in view of Meissner in view of Hoffman in view of Freund above,

and are not found to be persuasive for the same reasons. Therefore the rejection is deemed proper and made **FINAL**.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed in this application. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIC S. OLSON whose telephone number is (571)272-9051. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Anna Jiang can be reached on (571)272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eric S Olson/
Examiner, Art Unit 1623
5/5/2010